

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4 are amended. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully submit reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims at least in light of the following remarks.

**I. Interview Summary**

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiners Minskey and Lopez in the February 19, 2009 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the Substance of the Interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0160690 to Miyazawa (Miyazawa). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Miyazawa fails to disclose each and every feature recited in claim 1. For example, Miyazawa fails to disclose "wherein said lens member forming step forms a curved surface shape on the plastic materials so that a geometric center of the edge shape positions at a geometric center of the plastic material," as recited in claim 1.

Miyazawa discloses machining a lens according to prescription data input into a host computer (see Miyazawa, paragraph [0078] and Figure 4). In addition, Miyazawa discloses aligning a reference surface of a block jig 20 (which supports the lens during machining) to be parallel to a tangential line at the optical center of the surface to be machined (see Miyazawa, paragraph [0082]). Miyazawa further discloses that the optical center of the surface corresponds to a point located at a center of a pupil when the lens is inserted in a spectacle frame (see Miyazawa, paragraph [0082]). However, the center of a pupil does not necessarily align with the geometric center of the lens or the geometric center of the lens blank. Thus this is not the same as machining a lens so that the geometric center of the

machined lens and the lens blank are the same. Therefore, Miyazawa fails to disclose the above recited feature, thereby rendering claim 1 patentable over Miyazawa.

Independent claim 4 recites features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is also patentable at least for the reasons discussed above for claim 1 as well as for the additional features claim 4 recites.

Dependent claims 2, 3 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also patentable at least for their dependency from claim 1 as well as for the additional features that these claims recite.

Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-5 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Brian K. Kauffman  
Registration No. 63,199

JAO:BKK/amt

Date: February 27, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---